### **PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

## **PCT**

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 28 DEC 2005

		-
NIPO	. F	PCT

				VII O FOI			
	plicant's or agent's file reference 4-233PCT  FOR FURTHER ACTION  See Form PCT/IPEA/416			See Form PCT/IPEA/416			
International application No. International filing date (c) PCT/US2004/038936 19.11.2004		day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 20.11.2003				
	International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H01Q1/24						
•							
Applicant  MOLEX INCORPORATED et al.							
	<ol> <li>This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</li> </ol>						
2.	This REPORT consist	ts of a total of $5$ sheets, including the	ils cover sheet.	•			
з.	This report is also acc	companied by ANNEXES, comprisir	ıg:				
	a. 🛛 sent to the app	olicant and to the International Bure	au) a total of 10 sheets	, as follows:			
sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).							
	sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.						
b. (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (Indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)), containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).							
4.	4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:						
	☑ Box No. I Bas	sis of the opinion					
	☐ Box No. II Prid	Priority					
	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
ł		k of unity of invention		·			
	☑ Box No. V Rea	. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
1		No. VI Certain documents cited					
		x No. VII Certain defects in the international application					
	☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application						
Date of submission of the demand		Date of completion of this	s report				
17.08	6.2005		28.12.2005	,			
Name and mailing address of the international		Authorized Officer	hes Pilan.				
preliminary examining authority:				Server M. E.			
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich			Marot-Lassauzaie,	j <b>(()</b>			
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d			Talanka - Na - 40 00 0	200-2671			

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/038936

		•					
	Box No. I	Basis of the report	t				
1.	With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it villed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					h it was	
	☐ This re which	eport is based on transist is the language of a f	slations from the original ranslation furnished for	inal language into to or the purposes of:	the following langu :	ıage,	
		blication of the interna	der Rules 12.3 and 23 ational application (un examination (under F	der Rule 12.4)	55.3)		٠
2.	have been	furnished to the rece	the international app viving Office in respon re not annexed to this	se to an invitation :	is based on <i>(repla</i> under Article 14 al	acement sheet re referred to in	s which n this
				•			
	Description	ı, Pages	as originally filed	••		•	<b></b>
	1-10		as originally filed				
	Claims, Nu	mbers				•	
	1-37		received on 21.09.200	)5		•	. <i>'</i>
	Drawings,	Sheets				•	
	1/13-13/13		as originally filed				
	□ a seq	uence listing and/or a	ny related table(s) - s	ee Supplemental E	Box Relating to Se	quence Listing	
3.	☐ The a	mendments have res	ulted in the cancellati	on of:		•	
	□ the	e description, pages e claims, Nos.				•	
	☐ the	e drawings, sheets/fig				• • • •	
	⊔ the □ ar	e sequence listing <i>(sp</i> ny table(s) related to s	ecity): equence listing <i>(spec</i>	ify):		,	
4.	had not be	report has been estab een made, since they ental Box (Rule 70.2(c	olished as if (some of) have been considere s)).	the amendments a d to go beyond the	annexed to this re e disclosure as file	oort and listed d, as indicated	below in the
	□ th	e description, pages				•	•
	☐ th	e claims, Nos. e drawings, sheets/fig	IS			• •	
•	☐ th	e sequence listing <i>(si</i>	pecify): sequence listing <i>(spec</i>		en e		
		•	some or all of th		v be marked ".	superseded.	11

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/US2004/038936

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-36

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

io: Gains

1-36 `1-36

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

....

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2004/038936

#### Re Item V.

2

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 2003/129950 A1 (KWAK MIN-WOO) 10 July 2003 (2003-07-10) D2: US 2002/084938 A1 (KIM SEONG-YUN) 4 July 2002 (2002-07-04)

around the hinge. A tuning part is connected to the antenna in the closed position. The claims are directed to the construction of the contacts of the tuning part around the hinge. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-15, 18-22, 25, 28-31 and 34 are directed to the construction of the hinge in general, while claims 6,13,16,23,26,32,35 specify a capacitive coupling and claims 7, 17, 24, 27, 33, 36 specify a projection (sliding contact) is used.

Generally speaking, flip phones connecting a tuning device to their antenna according to the position of the hinge are known from either D1 or D2. Therefore claims 1-5, 8-12, 14-15, 18-22, 25, 28-31 and 34 lack novelty (Article 33(2) PCT). Additionally, document D1 discloses a flip phone with capacitive connection 120, 121 for an antenna 122a and an antenna extension (tuning part) 124. Therefore claims 6,13,16,23,26,32,35 lack novelty over this document (Article 33(2) PCT). As to document D2, this prior art describes projecting contacts 22, therefore claims 7,

The application is, in substance, directed to a flip phone with an antenna constructed

As to document D2, this prior art describes projecting contacts 22, therefore claims 7 17, 24, 27, 33, 36 lack novelty over this document (Article 33(2) PCT). claim is not new (Article 33(2) PCT).

#### Re Item VIII.

- 1. Although claims 1, 9, 19 and 28 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
- 2. It is clear from the description that the actual design of the antenna is different than

the one of either D1 or D2. In particular, neither in D1 nor in D2 is the tuning part in the shaft of the flip phone. The actual design of the antenna is also different (the application appears to use a meander antenna, which is almost entirely contained around the hinge). The examiner is of the opinion that these features are actually the ones that best define the invention. Since the independent claims de not contain these features they does not meet the requirement following from Article 6 PCT taken in combination with Rule 6.3(b) PCT that any independent claim must contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention.

Amending the claims to specify these essential features would solve the objection of lack of novelty raised under Item V at the same time.